

SIERRA SYSTEMS and WA OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Grants, Contracts & Loans Feasibility Study Project

Meeting Notes: Interview

January 9, 2006

Attendees:

X	Susan Dodson (OFM)	X	Kathy Rosmond, OFM
X	Sharon Novak (OFM)	X	Carol Baque, Sierra Systems
		X	Tom Babington, Sierra Systems

Interview Notes:

Roadmap Progress

The Roadmap models for grants have been updated on the website. Contract model will be updated soon. There will not be a value proposition for contracts until work on procurements is complete, scheduled for April or May 2006.

Solution Scope

This feasibility study will cover only sub-grants to recipients. From Roadmap process work, it appears grant agreements are contracts, just with a different legal authority.

Subgrant agreement number is the same as contract number. (need to verify this assumption with agencies)
Federal Government assigns a grant number that we may need to track as a data attribute.

On the grants “could be” process diagram, the scope of the grants, contracts and loans (GCL) solution should *avoid* tight integration of the Enterprise Resources band items. If any of their functionality is included in the solution, it should be loosely coupled.

Solution Reporting

The CGL solution will use OFM’s Enterprise Reporting system (Business Objects) for its management/enterprise reports. The project team will need to coordinate with the OFM enterprise reporting team to plan work and resource requirements.

Line-of-business and operational reports may be generated by the solution system itself. Data stores in the solution system must be independent of the application; data must be available to and compatible with Enterprise Reporting.

Kathy requested that any new enterprise data elements or proposals for changes of current enterprise data elements be brought to the attention of the Roadmap group.

Sharon said the BASS application uses a table that links zip code to legislative district.

It’s highly desirable that the solution have common components that could be used by other enterprise applications.

Core and Specific Requirements

Carol asked about deciding core vs. specific requirements. Kathy said they are forming Decision-Making Principles, but do not yet have a set that addresses business requirements. She said it will be up to the agency to justify any agency-specific needs.

The Grant Value Proposition draft – and discussion - lists these core items of immediate interest to the business case:

Performance measures

Elapsed time from advertisement to award (by major program)

Subgrant dollars where the state can demonstrate:

Who benefited

Where benefited (e.g., jurisdiction, legislative district) [this means GIS coordinates]

What was achieved

For contracts, the number of contracts in place before the program's target service delivery date

Internal measures

Number of applications processed

Number of grants awarded

Percent of fully compliant applications received

Percent of compliant and timely progress reports

Unmet need – applications compliant but not funded

Interest in location means potentially keeping multiple addresses, one for the recipient (sub-grantee) and one to many for the location(s) of the project, e.g. the riverbank being restored or the housing being built.

Sources for current costs for the business case:

Cost to operate the current ECY system AC supplemental budget request for PRISM

Berk report, now available on the Roadmap website

Solution Risks

Kathy stressed the critical importance of a successful implementation for phase 1 GCL system (the core system). It is also critical to manage expectations with a realistic release strategy in the implementation plan.

Kathy asked the team to identify any RCWs or WACs that may be in the way of a successful system, so OFM, Ecology, and CTED can start working policy issues as appropriate.

Susan said LA County has implemented a low-cost C-Lutions contracts system composed entirely of off-the-shelf Microsoft components. Susan has sent the link to this case study as well as the updated value proposition materials.

Next Steps

Susan asked that the feasibility study team be brought up to speed on the Roadmap progress. She sent links to the documents to Sharon; Sharon will forward the links to the team and encourage them to read the documents and keep the *Roadmap* could-be vision in mind as they review requirements for the system.